



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



THOMAS D.
WATKINS, JR.
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Thomas D. Watkins, Jr, Superintendent

DATE: May 14, 2004

SUBJ: Proposed Changes to *Education Yes!* For 2004 School Report Cards

At the meeting of the State Board of Education on May 11, 2004, staff presented proposals for changes to the 2004 *Education YES!* School Report Card. Two high-priority short-range issues were identified:

1. The need to eliminate or reduce the number of schools that were not able to be given a **Composite grade** because of the lack of a Status or Change grade.
2. The manner in which the grade for **Achievement Change** is calculated.

The State Board of Education reacted positively to the proposal regarding the composite grade which entails displaying separate Status and Change scores for each subject area (ELA and math for elementary schools; ELA, math, science, and social studies for middle and high schools). The lack of a score in one area will still allow Status and Change grades to be calculated on the remaining scores.

The Board raised questions about the proposal on the Achievement Change grade. This component of the Report Card was intended to recognize and give credit to schools whose Achievement Status scores were still below the state targets, but which were making progress in improving those scores. A school, for instance, with a Status grade of "D" might earn an Achievement grade of "C" or "B" if it was significantly increasing student achievement.

On the other hand, the Achievement Grade worked against many high-performing schools with high Status grades whose achievement scores declined slightly. In numerous cases, schools that had an "A" in Status received an "F" in Change because of a slight decline in their scores, even though, in spite of the decline, often brought about by statistical fluctuations, student

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • HERBERT S. MOYER – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • JOHN C. AUSTIN – TREASURER
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

achievement remained at a very high level. Parents and the community in these schools objected to the “F” grades, believing they misrepresented what they viewed as continued high performance by their schools. To use a baseball analogy, when Ted Williams batted .400 one year, and .395 the next year, no one would claim he is therefore no longer a good hitter!

Original Proposal

The Review Group (listed in Attachment A) recommended a revised method of calculating Change. It contains the following elements:

The overall score for a content area would be based on the school’s score for Status, averaged with the school’s score for Change.

- A “floor” would be established by specifying that a school’s Change score would be the higher of :
 1. The school’s actual Change score, using the calculation employed on the January report card, or
 2. The lowest score in the scoring category where the school’s actual Status score is located. (Example: 90-100 = an “A,” 80-89 = “B” etc. If a school’s Status score was 94, the lowest Change score it could receive would be 90. If a school’s Status score was 87, the lowest Change score it could receive would be 80, and so on through the lower score categories).
- In cases where a Change score cannot be computed, the Status score for each content area will be used to compute the overall score for that area, without the Change score.

Revised Proposal

The State Board reacted favorably to the intent of the proposal. However, the Board discussed the importance of conveying the message that schools that are not meeting the targets for achievement change are not on the trajectory to meet the goal of 100% proficiency in 2013-14, as required by the federal No Child Left Behind Act. The Board asked for impact data on a revised proposal with a lower “floor” that can be depicted as follows:

Status Score Range	Minimum Adjusted Change Score		Maximum Change Score
	Original Proposal	Revised Proposal	
90-100	90	80	100
80-89	80	70	100
70-79	70	60	100
60-69	60	50	100
50-59	50	50	100

Under the revised proposal, if a school's Status score was 94, the lowest Change score it could receive would be 80. If a school's Status score was 87, the lowest Change score it could receive would be 70, and so on through the lower score categories.

This system essentially establishes a "safe harbor" for schools which experience a slight decline in the percent of proficient students. In this system, the lowest score a school would receive is the bottom score of the grade category (the A, B, C, D, F categories) directly below the grade category of their Status score. This "safe harbor" provision, however, would apply to each content area for a school for two consecutive years only. In a third year of decline, the Change score would be calculated according to the regular formula, thus making it technically possible once again for an "A" Status school to earn an "F" in Change.

Impact data on the Revised Proposal are contained in Attachment B. Two measures of impact were used. The first measure was a comparison of the average composite score, reported on a scale of 50-100. The composite score is a reporting measure tied to the letter grade system. The simulation of the Review Group Proposal showed that the average composite score would rise from 80.6 to 83.1, an increase of 2.5 scale points. The simulation of the Revised Proposal yields a smaller rise in the average composite score, from 80.6 to 82.0, which is an increase of 1.4 scale points. The Revised Proposal has slightly more than half of the impact as the Review Group Proposal would have.

The simulation of the Review Group Proposal shows that 702 schools (28.4% of the schools) would be assigned a higher composite grade under the Review Group Proposal than the grade that the school was assigned in the 2003 Report Card. The simulation of the Revised Proposal indicates that 361 schools (14.6% of the schools) would be assigned a higher composite grade under the Review Group Proposal than the grade that the school was assigned in the 2003 Report Card. Comparing the impact of the two proposals, the Revised Proposal has slightly more than half of the impact as the Review Group Proposal would have in terms of the percentage of schools for which a higher composite grade is computed.

Examples of prototype report cards for actual schools, using the 2003 method and the proposed new formats are contained in Attachment C. The example school is the same school that was earlier presented as School A. In the example school, the composite score and grade are changed by the Review Group Proposal. The composite grade stays as a "B" under the Revised Proposal. This example shows that the downward trend of the scores is reflected in the reporting and scoring. The scoring has less of an adjustment under the Revised Proposal than the Review Group Proposal. The other example schools that were earlier presented are not shown because neither the Revised Proposal or the Review Group Proposal change the composite score or grade for these schools.

The benefits of the Revised Proposal can be summarized as follows:

- The proposal will continue to recognize improvements in student achievement;
- The change score will continue to have an impact, with a softer blow for schools that have high status scores and low change scores;
- There is minimal impact on the average composite score; and
- The proposal allows many more schools to be assigned a composite grade.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the Revised Proposal for Education YES! for 2004 school report cards as described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated May 14, 2004.

Education YES! Review Group

Ernest Bauer
Coordinator of Research, Evaluation and
Assessment
Oakland Schools

Erika Bolig
Assessment Coordinator
Grand Rapids Public Schools

David Buell
Assistant Director of General Education
Kent ISD

Michael Couchman
Superintendent
Pinkney Community Schools

Bruce Fay
Assessment Consultant
Wayne RESA

Kevin Hollenbeck
Portage Board of Education
Michigan Association of School Boards

Daniel Hunsburger
Assessment Coordinator
Forest Hills

Philip Kearney
Accreditation Advisory Committee
University of Michigan

Noni Miller
Deputy Superintendent for Instruction
Ypsilanti School District

Stephen Piereson
Superintendent
Ishpeming Public Schools

William Scaletta
Principal
Lakeshore High School (Berrien)

Nancy Shiffler
Assessment Coordinator
Ann Arbor Public Schools

Judi Scholten
School Improvement Consultant
Kent ISD

Sandi Schwartz Spencer
Assessment Coordinator
Birmingham Public Schools

Cindy Sierra
Curriculum Coordinator
Kearsley Community Schools

Regina Thomas
Director of Accountability
Detroit Public Schools

David Treder
Coordinator of Research, Evaluation and
Assessment
Genesee ISD

Doug VanderJagt
Assessment Coordinator
Rockford Public Schools

Kim Wells
Central Michigan University
Charter Schools Office

Impact Data

A simulation was created to examine the impact of the proposed reporting formats. The simulation examined the 2003 report card data, showing what would happen if the proposed formats had been used with the 2003 data. The following table compares the average composite score (for all schools) using the Review Group Proposal and the Revised Proposal:

Calculation Method	Average Composite Score
Composite Score – 2003 Report Card	80.6
Review Group Proposal	83.1
Revised Proposal	82.0

The simulation of the Review Group Proposal tells us that the average composite score would rise from 80.6 to 83.1, which is an increase of 2.5 scale points. The simulation of the Revised Proposal yields a smaller rise in the average composite score, from 80.6 to 82.0, which is an increase of 1.4 scale points. The Revised Proposal has slightly more than half of the impact as the Review Group Proposal would have.

The simulation also allows the comparison of the composite grades assigned under the new format, and the previous. The following table compares the grades assigned in 2003 with the grade that would have been assigned using the Review Group Proposal:

Crosstabulation of 2003 Composite Grade by Composite Grade – Review Group Proposal

Composite Grade – Review Group Proposal	Composite Grade – 2003					
	A	B	C	D	F	Total
A	330	269	8	0	0	607
B	0	743	372	1	0	1,116
C	0	0	602	50	0	652
D	0	0	0	89	2	91
F	0	0	0	0	7	7
Total	330	1,012	982	140	9	2,473

The simulation of the Review Group Proposal shows that 702 schools (28.4% of the schools) would be assigned a higher composite grade under the Review Group Proposal than the grade that the school was assigned in the 2003 Report Card.

A simulation was also run comparing the composite grades of the 2003 Report Card with the composite grades computed under the Revised Proposal. The results are provided in the following table:

Crosstabulation of 2003 Composite Grade by Composite Grade – Revised Proposal

Composite Grade – Revised Proposal	Composite Grade – 2003					
	A	B	C	D	F	Total
A	330	138	0	0	0	468
B	0	874	204	0	0	1,078
C	0	0	778	18	0	796
D	0	0	0	122	1	123
F	0	0	0	0	8	8
Total	330	1,012	982	140	9	2,473

The simulation of the Revised Proposal indicates that 361 schools (14.6% of the schools) would be assigned a higher composite grade under the Review Group Proposal than the grade that the school was assigned in the 2003 Report Card. Comparing the impact of the two proposals, the Revised Proposal has slightly more than half of the impact as the Review Group Proposal would have in terms of the percentage of schools for which a higher composite grade is computed.

Comparison of Current and Proposed School Report Cards

This is a high status elementary school that did not receive an “automatic B” under the current procedure. This school received a status grade of “A” and a change grade of “F”, for a composite grade of “B”. The school and the community feel that this school should not be expected to show dramatic improvement, given the high status. The prototype shows the actual and adjusted change scores and the scores and grades for English language arts and mathematics. The composite score and grade are changed by the Review Group Proposal. The composite grade stays as a “B” under the Revised Proposal.

2003 Education YES! Report Card

Component	Score	Grade
Achievement Status	96.0	A
Achievement Change	50.0	F
Indicators of School Performance	99.0	A
Preliminary Score and Grade	81.8	B
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	Met AYP	

2004 Education YES! Report Card Prototype As Proposed by Review Group

	Status	Change		Score	Grade
		Actual	Adjusted		
Student Achievement					
English language arts	92.9	50.0	90.0	91.5	A
Mathematics	99.1	50.0	90.0	94.6	A
Achievement Subtotal	96.0	50.0	90.0	93.0	A
Indicators of School Performance				99.0	A
Preliminary Score and Grade				95.0	A
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)				Met AYP	
Composite Grade				A	

2004 Education YES! Report Card Prototype Revised Proposal

	Status	Change		Score	Grade
		Actual	Adjusted		
Student Achievement					
English language arts	92.9	50.0	80.0	86.5	B
Mathematics	99.1	50.0	80.0	89.6	B
Achievement Subtotal	96.0	50.0	80.0	88.0	B
Indicators of School Performance				91.7	A
Preliminary Score and Grade				89.2	B
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)				Met AYP	
Composite Grade				B	

The following charts show the achievement change data for English language arts and for mathematics for school A.

